



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,924	11/09/2006	Akihiko Nakamura	044499-0275	6861

22428 7590 04/01/2008
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

YACOB, SISAY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,924	NAKAMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SISAY YACOB	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1 The application of Nakamura et al. for "Service Providing Apparatus, Service Providing Program, Computer-Readable Medium, Service Providing, and Key Unit" filed on November 09, 2006 has been examined.

Claims 10 and 11 are canceled.

Claims 1-9 and 12-13 are pending.

Drawings

2 The drawings are objected to because Figures 8-9 have to be labeled as prior arts as they are described in the specification. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3 Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 2, lines 3 and 4 the phrase "unlocking the door" is repeated.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2612

4 Claims 6, 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6 depends on a multiple dependent claim 5. Claim 7 depends on a multiple dependent claim 6. Claim 8 depends on a multiple dependent claim 7.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6 Claims 1, 2, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication of McIntock et al. (20020099945 A1).

7 As to claims 1 and 12, McIntock et al. discloses a service providing for a security management apparatus (Page 2, Par. 0020; Item 10) characterized by comprising: an operation sensor (Page 3, Par. 0030; Item 24) that judges whether a user has operated an access point (Item 20) in an object of operation by the user (Item 32), an access sensor (Page 3, Par. 0028; Item 22) that judges whether the user is present in a near area where the user could be present when the user operates the access point (Page 3, Par. 0029, lines 1-8), and control

Art Unit: 2612

means (Page 3, Par. 0031, lines 1-6; Item 28) that controls an operation of the service providing apparatus (Page 3, Par. 0031, lines 1-10), and in that the control means includes: ID authentication means (Item 40) that performs ID authentication for the user on the basis of results of the judgment of the access sensor and the operation sensor (Page 3, Par. 0031, lines 1-10), and external processing determining means that selects a service from a plurality of services corresponding to at least one of the result of the judgment of the operation sensor (Page 3, Par. 0033; Item 60), the result of the judgment of the access sensor and a result of the ID authentication of the ID authentication means and causes an external apparatus to execute the service (Page 3, Par. 0034; See also figures 1-3).

8 As to claim 2, McLintock et al. discloses the object of operation by the user is a door for entering the house (Page 2, Par. 0002), the access point is a door knob (Item 20) of the door (Item 30) and, on the other hand, the operation sensor detects an operation of a key (Page 2, Par. 0020; Page 3, Par. 0028; Item 22), which is used for unlocking the door (Page 3, Par. 0029), unlocking the door (Page 3, Par. 0030).

9 As to claims 9 and 13, McLintock et al. discloses a service providing for a security management method (Page 2, Par. 0020; Item 10), characterized by comprising: a first step of judging, with an operation sensor of a service providing apparatus (Page 3, Par. 0030; Item 24), whether a user (Item 32) has operated

Art Unit: 2612

an access point (Item 20) in an object of operation by the user (Page 3, Par. 0029, lines 1-8), a second step of performing, with ID authentication means of the service providing apparatus (Page 3, Par. 0030), ID authentication for the user based on a result of the judgment of the operation sensor (Page 3, Par. 0031, lines 1-10; Item 28), and a third step of selecting, with external processing determining means of the service providing apparatus (Page 3, Par. 0033; Item 60), a service from a plurality of services corresponding to at least one of the result of the judgment of the operation sensor, the result of the judgment of the access sensor and a result of the ID authentication of the ID authentication means and causing, with the external processing determining means, an external apparatus to execute the service (Page 3, Par. 0034; See also figures 1-3).

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11 The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2612

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12 Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLintock et al. in view of the Japanese Publication of Tsukasaki Fumio (2002-327561), hereinafter "Fumio".

13 As to claims 3 and 4, McLintock et al. discloses the object of operation by the user is a door for entering the house (Page 2, Par. 0002), the access point is a door knob (Item 20) of the door (Item 30).

However, McLintock et al. does not expressly disclose the operation sensor is a pressure sensor that detects, when a key used for unlocking the door is inserted into a keyhole of the door, a force generated in a direction of the key from the keyhole and rotated, torque generated in the key.

Fumio discloses an operation pressure sensor that detects, when a door knob is used for opening a door and a force generated in a direction of the opening the door (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the service providing apparatus of McLintock et al. by incorporating the pressure sensor that is attached to the door knob, as disclosed by Fumio, in order to have the object of operation by the user is a door for entering the house, the access point is a door knob of the door and, on the

Art Unit: 2612

other hand, the operation sensor is a pressure sensor that detects, when a key used for unlocking the door is inserted into a keyhole of the door, a force generated in a direction of the key from the keyhole and rotated, torque generated in the key, because both prior arts are directed to solving the same problem and Fumio discloses the limitation that activates an alarm condition when a pressure is detected on the door knob, which one skilled in the art readily recognize having this feature into the keyhole, wherein an operation sensor is a pressure sensor that detects, when a key used for unlocking the door is inserted into a keyhole of the door, a force generated in a direction of the key from the keyhole and rotated, torque generated in the key may facilitate enhanced security.

14 Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLintock et al. in view of "Fumio" and further in view of the U.S. Patent of Nieuwkoop (5,195,341).

15 As to claim 5, as set forth above in claims 1-4, the combination of McLintock et al. and Fumio disclose the object of operation by the user is a door for entering the house, the access point is a door knob of the door and an operation sensor.

However, the combination of McLintock et al. and Fumio does not expressly disclose the operation sensor includes a coil provided in the door knob, magnetic field generating means that generates an induction field with the coil,

Art Unit: 2612

and detecting means that detects a magnetic force change in the induction field generated by the magnetic field generating means.

Nieuwkoop disclose a service providing apparatus that includes an operation sensor includes a coil provided in the door knob (handle), magnetic field generating means that generates an induction field with the coil, and detecting means that detects a magnetic force change in the induction field generated by the magnetic field generating means (Col. 3, line 34 – Col. 4, line 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of McLintock et al. and Fumio by incorporating the operation sensor that includes a coil, as disclosed by Nieuwkoop, in order to have the object of operation by the user is a door for entering the house, the access point is a door knob of the door and, on the other hand, the operation sensor includes: a coil provided in the door knob, magnetic field generating means that generates an induction field with the coil, and detecting means that detects a magnetic force change in the induction field generated by the magnetic field generating means, because Fumio discloses an operation pressure sensor that detects, when a door knob is used for opening a door and a force generated in a direction of the opening the door and Nieuwkoop discloses an operation sensor includes a coil provided in the door knob (handle), magnetic field generating means that generates an induction field with the coil, and detecting means that detects a magnetic force change in the induction field

Art Unit: 2612

generated by the magnetic field generating means, so one skilled in the art readily recognize having the features would facilitate enhanced security.

16 As to claim 6, McLintock et al. discloses a radio communication means that is capable of switching width of an area, in which communication is possible, by switching an output of a radio wave used for communication, and in that the ID authentication means performs ID authentication for the user by judging whether ID information acquired from an ID authentication terminal carried by a user by performing narrow area radio communication using the ID authentication terminal and the radio communication means is included in permission ID information recorded in the service providing apparatus and, on the other hand, when it is impossible to acquire proper ID information via the radio communication means, transmits information indicating that it is impossible to acquire proper ID information to the external apparatus by performing wide area radio communication using the radio communication means (Page 3, Par. 0029).

17 As to claims 7 and 8, McLintock et al. discloses a computer to function as the control means and a computer-readable recording medium, characterized by having recorded therein (Page 3, Par. 0030-0034).

CONCLUSION

18 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following cited arts are further to show the state of art related to a service providing apparatus and a security management method.

In the U.S. Patent of (6,624,739 B1) Stobbe discloses an access control system having at least one mobile transponder having an authorization code, which is to be carried by a person, and at least one local control station having a reader by which the authorization code of the transponder can be read as it is moved close to the reader in a non-contact manner and can be transmitted over a network to a primary and/or control code evaluation device.

In the U.S. Patent of (6,023,224) Meyvis discloses automated door entry that senses the presence of person within a area and upon receiving a signal from the device that is held by the person, it verifies and grant access to the entrance/door.

CORRESPONDANCE

19 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SISAY YACOB whose telephone number is (571)272-8562. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery A. Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981.

Art Unit: 2612

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sisay Yacob

3/22/2008

/Davetta W. Goins/
Acting SPE of Art Unit 2612